THEOLOGY

VOL. LXII JUNE, 1959 No. 468

Editorial

THE Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament is a good thing in so far as it provides scope for a corporate expression of the sense of frustration, and indeed of horror, which all humane people must feel at the waste of man's resources and energies in the manufacture of weapons of destruction, at the risks to man's health that are entailed in their preparation and testing, and at the unspeakable prospect of the possible outbreak of unlimited nuclear warfare. There is no reason to doubt that our own statesmen, not to say those of other nations, are as sensitive as any of us to the perils that beset mankind, but they may justly consider that they are better employed in trying to carry through political negotiations by which those perils may be mitigated, if not eliminated, than in constantly advertising them and so keeping public opinion in a state of agitated fear.

Nevertheless, citizens who find themselves powerless to do anything directly at the level of international diplomacy or national policy need some way of testifying to their heartfelt concern for the future not only of themselves but of the whole human race. The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament enables the apparently powerless to beseech those who administer power to bend all their efforts to transforming the impulses of destruction into enterprises of construction. It enables the instincts of compassion to be made flesh alongside the resolution to face the hardest of hard facts.

It is another matter if the impression is given that there is a simple and straightforward method of removing the sources of international conflict and of abolishing nuclear weapons which statesmen are too obtuse to perceive or too irresponsible to pursue. While we do not take a particularly high view of the capacities of contemporary statesmen, they are doing, so far as we can see, the best that they can do, or that anyone else in their position could do, to preserve the world from the appalling dangers by which it is menaced. If the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament is regarded as advocating a viable policy for our own and other governments, it should embody its proposals in a plan that will touch the basic causes of the international struggle for power. We do not believe that our statesmen are so blind or so wicked that they would not welcome the discovery of a policy which was more likely to achieve international peace and concord than that which at present they are reluctantly convinced has the best prospect of success.

In any case, there never was a time when the duty of Christians to uphold the political authorities with their prayers was more evident.

* * * * *

Many of the considerations with which a Christian has to reckon in facing the great question of which we have been speaking are brought

out in a small collection of essays that has lately appeared, *Morals and Missiles: Catholic essays on the problem of war to-day,* edited by Charles S. Thompson (James Clarke and Co., 2s. 6d.). The contributors include a Jesuit, a Benedictine and a Dominican, together with Sir Compton Mackenzie, Mr Christopher Hollis and Mr E. I. Watkin. Their approaches are very different and they reach no agreed conclusion, but any Christian who feels that his conscience needs a jolt will find it here.

* * * * *

We welcome the formation of the "New Churches Research Group". Its object is to study the design of new churches with a view to relating it both to modern architectural thinking and to contemporary biblical and patristic scholarship and liturgical practice, and to promote an understanding of significant work that is being done in this field abroad as well as at home. It will arrange conferences and lectures, produce publications, and maintain contact with similar groups in other countries. An informative leaflet may be had from the Secretary, 10a Dacre Street, London, S.W.1, if a stamped and addressed envelope is sent.

* * * * *

Autres temps autres mœurs.—"Rich and splendid situations in the church have been justly regarded as prizes held out to invite persons of good hopes and ingenuous attainments to enter its service. The value of the prospect may be the same, but the allurement is much greater, where opulent shares are reserved to reward the success of a few, than where, by a more equal partition of the fund, all indeed are competently provided for, but no one can raise even his hopes beyond a penurious mediocrity of subsistence and situation. It is certainly of consequence that young men of promising abilities be encouraged to engage in the ministry of the church; otherwise, our profession will be composed of the refuge of every other. None will be found content to stake the fortune of their lives in this calling, but they whom slow parts, personal defects, or a depressed condition of birth and education, preclude from advancement in any other."—William Paley, "A Distinction of Orders in the Church defended upon Principles of public Utility, in a Sermon preached in the Castle-Chapel, Dublin, at the Consecration of John Law, D.D., Lord Bishop of Clonfert and Kilmacdaugh, September 21, 1782".

The Case of Assistant Curates

Considerable attention has been given in the press and elsewhere to the establishment of a reasonable basic stipend for all incumbents. Reorganization schemes, allocations from the Church Commission and increased giving from the parishes through the diocesan quota have enabled dioceses to make real progress and the result is that most have achieved a basic stipend of £650 or more. In addition to this, in many dioceses, the Easter Offering is no longer reckoned

when arriving at this basic sum, and in all dioceses this figure is free from deductions for dilapidations and rates. The time is not far distant when all incumbents will be sure of at least £700 a year. This should reduce to very small proportions the hardship hitherto felt by many.

When we look at the case of assistant curates, we find a very different story. Their lot is all too often hard and far too many are haunted by fears of insolvency.

There is no country-wide scale and each diocese has its own method of fixing a basic stipend and of deciding about increments and allowances. The situation can be summed up as follows:

Basic Stipend.—Anything up to £400 a year or more with a varying number of annual increments. These are usually in the range of £10 a year for about three years.

Allowances.—In most dioceses, there is a marriage allowance of £50 a year and about £30 for the first child. There is divergence about subsequent children. As the second and succeeding children get allowances under the National Insurance scheme, certain dioceses make no allowance for any child after the first.

It will be seen that a married man with one child might be receiving about £470 after a year of service in any one diocese, although it could be more. Some parishes which do not ask for diocesan grant may pay something well over diocesan scale. But we need to take into account a number of other facts before we can arrive at any real assessment of the position.

There are a number of possible "extras" which may be paid by the P.C.C. These may include the whole or part of the Whitsun offering; the whole or part of the 12s. a week payable for the National Health Insurance; the £9 a year payable for widow's pension; a widely varying sum paid towards expenses of office. I have no means of finding out the facts accurately, but it might not be far from the truth to sum up the position thus. Only a minority receive all the extras set out above, and a very small number receive none. In my episcopal area of the diocese of Southwark I find that most get the N.H.I. and Widow's Pension money paid, and thus they receive about £40 a year from this source. The Whitsun offering will vary enormously and could range between £5 or £6 to something in the neighbourhood of £60 to £70. Incidentally, I can never understand why these are taxed. I have always been told that the Easter offering is the dues, mentioned in the rubric, and therefore is really an official payment. But this cannot be said of the Whitsun offering, and taxing this parochial gift seems very unfair. But I know of no curate who does not have to pay tax on this free gift from the parish.

Priests who have been assistant curates for a number of years qualify for limited grants from extra-diocesan sources. These are so few in number that the general picture is not much altered and they can be neglected in this broad assessment of the position.

Against all this we have to take into account outgoings. If a house is provided by the parish, most dioceses allow the P.C.C. to deduct a sum of anything up to £75 a year for rent and rates. By no means

all make that deduction; some make no deduction, and others deduct a smaller sum. I have no exact figures, but I suspect that the majority of the married men make some payment towards the cost of accommodation. Thus in the example we took above, the curate might receive only about £400 a year on which to live with his family. But this figure is a paper one only, and where rent deductions apply, it is probable that some or all of the allowances set out above may be paid by the parish. Looking at it broadly, our example may in practice have something like £450 a year on which to run his house.

No mention has yet been made of the cost of living. This varies enormously, as we all know. Here I must draw on my personal knowledge. A fairly well-off suburban parish will be more expensive to live in than an inner industrial parish where there are markets, cut-price shops and barrow boys. Some of my men have supplied me with exact figures, and I estimate that the difference may well run into five or six shillings a week. £15 a year is a serious matter when the total income is as I have described.

Metropolitan dioceses benefit by the London Holiday Fund, which may help to solve the annual problem of how to get a holiday without running into the red. This fund is for all of the clergy and not only for the unbeneficed. But I am usually able to give some limited help from the fund to about a third of the assistant curates in my charge. Against this we have to set the fact that, unlike most other professions, there is no London Weighting on clerical stipends. Without some help, a holiday may be out of the question, and I am never happy about a very inexperienced man having to take a locum perhaps within only a few weeks of his ordination as priest. Now and then a generous person offers a house free to a clergyman and his family, but if any such person should read these lines, let me ask him or her to notify the diocese of this offer towards the beginning of the year. So often we only hear of such an offer in late May or June, and by then plans have been made and the offer has to go begging.

All this concerns three groups of men. There is first the unmarried man living in the vicarage or clergy house. For the most part these have good accommodation and are not overcharged. I have found no case of hardship here.

Then there is the unmarried man living in rooms. Very often his lot is parlous in the extreme. Accommodation is very difficult to find, for most landladies prefer to have someone who is out all day and only wants bed and breakfast and an evening meal. The bachelor may have to accept a single room and undertake to get his mid-day meal out. Let me quote an actual case. The only possible room for this bachelor was some distance from the church; he was required to be out for the whole of one day a week; no mid-day meal was provided and he was a fourpenny bus ride from the nearest reasonably cheap cafés and cafeterias; he was charged four guineas a week, and this did not include heating, baths or laundry. He was newly ordained and was thus paying out a very large part of his stipend on board and lodging, and it was not a satisfactory lodging. While I know of no other case as bad as this, something like it is by no means

rare and many are having a very thin time. The bachelor priest must not be forgotten.

The third group is the most numerous—the young married man with a child or with children. He has probably had to furnish a house for the first time, and this will use up any savings he may have and may well set his feet on the long and dreary road of the hire purchase scheme. Is it surprising that some wives take a job? We may deplore this, but it is unrealistic to condemn it without reference to circumstances.

Some accommodation for married men, offered by the parish, is far from ideal. While I know of no such accommodation which could properly be termed a scandal, there are too many instances of very cramped and inconvenient so-called flats and of minute and wholly unmodernized houses. It is permissible to wonder whether members of the P.C.C. have inspected the living quarters which they provide for the assistant curate. One member of a P.C.C. told me with pride about the quarters offered to the curate. The house was a large and gracious house, properly divided but, as with many of that period, containing large rooms with huge windows. When I asked him how the man was to afford carpets and curtains and, further, was to keep such large rooms warm in the winter, the gentleman in question was forced to admit that he had never thought of that point.

This would be a very incomplete picture unless we bring forward the most hopeful factor, and that is the growing determination on the part of many Church Councils to secure a reasonable living wage and proper accommodation. There are, it is true, still many councils who have not begun to take this matter seriously, but the number of such bodies decreases every year, and the time may not be far distant when there will be a more general acceptance of this duty towards unbeneficed members of the staff by the laity as a whole.

I conclude with some practical suggestions. The first concerns the Commissioners. I have never been able to understand why the first benefice grant of up to £60 is not made into a "first house" grant. The majority to-day who are presented to a benefice have already had to face the appalling expense of furnishing a house. Surely the financial crisis occurs when the man has to furnish. It is true that the grant for the first benefice may well prove to be most useful in paying the cost of the move, although this applies to every subsequent move which the priest may make. Far better to help him at the start. It would mean a considerable sum to be paid out immediately, but it would soon even out and involve no larger sum being allocated for this purpose over a period of years.

The second suggestion concerns the diocese. I have never been persuaded that the system of increments is the best way to use available funds. Our calling does not include this as other callings do. Would it not be preferable to have one increment only at the time of ordination to the priesthood and to increase the starting figure by £10 or £15? When a balanced budget depends on pennies, what might be thought to be a very tiny increase means more than most wage-earners can hope to understand.

The third suggestion is a matter for the parish. The payment of N.H.I. and the Widows' Pension should be regarded as normal. If it be thought that a telephone is necessary for the curate, the parish should at least pay the rental. Any house bought should be provided with power plugs, for it is most unlikely that there will be even a "daily" once a week, and electric fires save an enormous amount of work. And the kitchen should be as labour-saving as can be devised. Otherwise the young wife, with perhaps two or three young children, finds the provision of meals more than she can manage.

We can easily overlook the fact that shoes need repairing, clothes wear out, cups get broken, and so along the whole list of recurrent expenses. Do layfolk expect the clergy to preach well when the curate cannot afford to buy books? Is he to be wholly cut off from aesthetic enjoyment because he cannot afford to go to a recital of music? I have heard complaints about the length of a curate's hair. I wondered whether the one who complained thought of the probability that it was not possible to find the money for a hair-cut until the next cheque came in. Some of our people might well consider such points.

I want to add a tribute to the men themselves. I have never heard one of them grumble. What I know has had to be extracted by persistent questioning, and even the most hard pressed show a cheerfulness which is not irresponsibility, and a real willingness to face hardship for Christ. These men and their wives never attempt to arouse public opinion, and that is why I accepted the editor's invitation to write this, so that I might say what needs to be said for those who will not say it for themselves.

WILLIAM KINGSTON.

The Constitutional Revolution, 1828-32

AND ITS CONSEQUENCES FOR THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH

THE events that made the revolution in church and state fell in the years 1828–35. Despite its peacefulness (and for all the riots and arson and fierce talk and, in Ireland, refusal to pay tithe, it *was* peaceful, by general European standards, and men knew it) and despite the conspiracy of all Whigs and, for some of the time, some Conservatives, to convince the public that nothing so startling as a revolution had happened, plenty of thoughtful men fully appreciated its scope and significance as each successive event carried it a step further. By the time of the Reform Act and the Irish Church Bill a great many of them were well prepared for such responses to it as the church reformers on one side, the Tractarians on the other, suggested. Its *formal* beginning was in 1828; that was when, as W. F. Hook put it, the state "virtually renounced every connexion with religion"; but ancestral landmarks had been sinking below the horizon, and minds had been seeking new bearings, for many years. For most practical purposes, they traced their troubles back to "that

kind of moral earthquake"—the French Revolution and the movements associated with it.

Conservative churchmen believed that the French Revolution was only the breaking out in France of a movement long preparing and deep-rooted in all the countries of Europe—"an Atheistical Philosophy deeply and extensively organized". A future Primate told his clergy in 1814 that "it was the struggle of desperate wickedness to shake off the salutary restraints imposed by religion and law on the worst passions of human nature". Wherever "a project thus singular in atrocity" caught on, its success signified either the fatal thoroughness of its preparation or the moral depravity of that society; wherever it ultimately failed—as, happily, in England—it showed the uprightness and strength of Government (thus all the fuss about Pitt) or the moral strength of society, they were not sure which. "The French Revolution" and the catch-words associated with it ("philosophy, light, liberality, the rights of men") meant, through the first half of the nineteenth century, not just an awful event of the past but an awful possibility for the present. "Liberality!" exploded one of the church's heaviest lay guns in 1823, "that word produced twenty years of confusion and misery in France: it threatened Italy, Spain and Portugal, and produced much mischief in those countries. It still threatens France; it annoys Germany; it has spread into Russia; and it is seriously threatening the British Empire with the overthrow of all its ancient institutions. . . ." The substance of its threat was atheism, democracy and tyranny, the destruction of religious establishment, and of the rights of property, and this terrible possibility was kept alive and imminent wherever the pernicious principles that had fired the great original still flourished.

Most men's acquaintance with those principles to-day comes from Newman's well-known list of them appended under the head "Liberalism" to most editions of the *Apologia*. He summarized them neatly; but his analysis was not original. Sensible and cultivated Conservatives had been saying the same thing for years. You find much the same analysis, for instance, in Robert Southey's *Letter to William Smith,* of 1817; in the younger Rennell's *Remarks upon Scepticism,* 1819; you meet elements of it in almost all the more generalizing episcopal charges of the period 1800–20; it was never out of Coleridge's mind or political writings after 1815; and the two fullest discussions of it that I know came (were the dates significant?) in 1829 and 1830, with Southey's *Sir Thomas More; or, Colloquies on the Progress and Prospects of Society,* which quickly acquired the distinction of an attack from Macaulay, and H. J. Rose's *Brief Remarks on the Dispositions towards Christianity generated by prevailing Opinions and Pursuits,* which were not all that brief and show how much real culture and ability Rose possessed besides the unintelligent conservatism that consumed him after the Reform Bill. He selected for special notice, "the numberless and distracting objects of pursuit [i.e. the rush of modern life, the widening diffusion of smatterings of knowledge of many subjects, etc.]—the consequent power of the periodical press [especially newspapers]—the depart-

ments of intellectual research most in favour [economics, the physical sciences, and romantic fiction]—the direction of all pursuits to *utility*—the establishment of *expediency* as the rule of right—the strange indifference as to the principles which guide the conduct of those among whom we live [an indifference shown especially in the failure of Government to censor the press and enforce public education in the principles of the established church]".

By the 1820s there was a good deal of sober optimism among Conservative churchmen that they might yet succeed in saving the old constitution and master the tendencies deriving from "Liberality", "the March of Mind", and so on. The collapse of one of its most essential parts in 1828, therefore, shocked them deeply, though, as it actually happened, unostentatiously. The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts brought no immediate danger to the establishment; its friends and enemies agreed that its practical effects would be negligible; but its enemies found it unpalatable on two counts. It abandoned an essential principle, that of the establishment's legal and political superiority over the nonconformists, which did not matter the less because it had been charitably kept in cold storage for the past hundred years; and the abandoning was done and justified by the parliamentary leaders of their own party, self-styled "friends of the church", who took it upon themselves to determine what departures from principle, or readjustments of principle if you preferred to call them that, might safely be made if the state of society or the good of the church or both demanded them. An old landmark disappeared; a significant part, as they regarded it, of the time-honoured constitution in church and state was jettisoned; and the change was justified as appropriate to "the spirit of the age" and as a reasonable concession to an influential part of public opinion.

The most important thing about these objections to the Act of 1828 is that the very same objections had to be made to each of the several acts by which the constitutional revolution was accomplished. Wellington, Peel and Goulburn were no better than Grey, Russell and Brougham; as Chalmers remarked to the Edinburgh presbytery in April 1832, it was an error they all shared, to show more anxiety to please important classes of subjects "than to find out what was in itself right". 1829 marked another betrayal of old principle by certain "friends of the church" in the church's best interests and in concession (they liked to speak as if it were gratuitous, generous concession, but of course it was largely forced) to another part of public opinion. The Irish National Board of Education in 1831 was the same, with the emphasis off public demand and on the spirit of the age, and so was the Reform Bill. The Whigs' arguments for that were substantially similar to those used by the concessionists in 1828 and 1829. Some of them certainly believed that their reforming principles were, in the abstract, right; but their main argument for them after all was that times had changed and were changing; that the spirit of the age indicated a move in this direction; that the unreformed representative system made Government unpopular and the populace disaffected; and that the disaffected whom they meant to mollify

and admit to the still rather exclusive club would turn out to be valuable members, sufficiently grateful for their admission to be deferential to the older hands. These are the attitudes Rose had in view when he spoke of "*utility* . . . the establishment of *expediency* as the rule of right" and the influence of the newspaper press.

1832 was not the end of the revolution promoted and justified by arguments of this kind. The Irish Church Bill of 1833, the Municipal Corporations Act and the institution of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners in 1835 rested on the same principles. By the end of it the English constitution had changed from what it had essentially been for the past millenium, an aristocratic semi-confessional state (with its proper rigours lately much mitigated in practice) to that of a semi-democratic liberal state (with its proper line of development to full democracy clearly marked).

When churchmen at this crisis of their affairs proclaimed "The Church is finished!" they meant one or both of two things. They may have had in mind the menace to all churches, to Christianity itself, brought by "Liberalism"; they may simply have been thinking that the established church could not long survive in the new era, not without radical changes anyway. Most of those who thought the church was finished in the latter sense necessarily regretted it. To the clergy of the poorer benefices and the hungry hordes of curates, however, the revolution could bring promise of a better share of the church's wealth. Those who were trying to help them, church reformers who had been working steadily under unfriendly legal conditions for twenty years or so, might also—if they were not of the kind to be horror-stricken at what had happened—look forward to making faster progress under the new constitution. Or it was possible to make the best of a bad job by reflecting with R. H. Froude that the revolution seemed to be "only the fermentation of filth which [had] long been in existence and could not be got rid of otherwise". But whether churchmen liked or disliked or were not sure what they felt about the revolution, it was difficult (except in the Holland House circle, where no religious topic but freedom of conscience ever excited much concern) not to be concerned about it.

In its own form and functioning, the established church carried on much as before. The bishops still sat in the Lords, a third of the magistracy was still in orders; no churches had been burnt down (save only some of York Minster, by a religious fanatic), no clergy strung from lamp-posts and surprisingly few of them rabbled. This apparently unbroken continuity in so many practical respects must have helped to conceal from many, especially country clergy, the precise character of what had happened. But that the political situation of the church *had* radically changed, its enemies lost no opportunity of reminding it.

The main tangible token of the church's new situation was the openness and savagery with which its enemies assailed it. The safe achievement of their long ambition in 1828 had relieved the protestant dissenters from the necessity (felt by most though not all of them) of concealing or playing down their radical hostility to the

establishment; the Reform Act made it absolutely safe for them to come into the open, to say whatever they liked about it and to work for its undoing. Some of the clergy, particularly those who had specialized in anti-dissenting polemics, had always known how antagonistic the dissenters were at bottom to the establishment. When this became clear to *everyone* after 1830, they had the satisfaction of saying, "We told you so". But to many clergy and statesmen, who had thought or hoped differently, it came as an unwelcome surprise to realize how greatly dissenters could dislike the establishment, or how much their hostility towards it had increased.

With the Roman Catholics the case was just the same. Many of the Conservatives who, sharing Peel's hopes and fears, had rallied to his side in 1829 and made up majorities for "Catholic Emancipation" would not have done so had they been able to foresee the Reform Act. Politics after 1831 became full of complaints by conservatives (including many aristocratic Whigs) that the Irish papists were showing a hostility towards the protestant establishment in their country which they had previously concealed or denied—that their members of parliament were breaking their oath not to "subvert the present church establishment" or "disturb or weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant government in the U.K."—and that they were showing gross ingratitude for the concessions made to them. They appealed to the papists' better feelings; it was all they *could* do; and, naturally, they appealed in vain. Thus the Reform Act, coming so unforeseeably close on the heels of the Acts of 1828 and 1829, gave those Acts a consequence wildly different from what their originators had expected.

Now, the great change sealed and confirmed by the Reform Act, together with the political ideas it (in some respects imperfectly) embodied, was the replacement of Burke's principle of "virtual representation" by the liberal principle of "direct representation". The messy, irrational character of the unreformed system had been justified by Burke and his disciples as nevertheless "virtually" representing all classes and interests of society, and raising Government, divinely ordained Government, well above the pressures from this or that part of public opinion that systems of "direct" representation inevitably admitted and that democracy actually invited. Government under the old system could dare to ignore what Peel in 1820 called "that great compound of folly, weakness, prejudice, wrong feeling, right feeling, obstinacy and newspaper paragraphs which is called public opinion", not for as long or as totally as a system not even "virtually" representative, but long and resolutely enough to carry out its paternal duties by its subjects whether they liked it or not. It was not expected to be popular or to court popularity; in 1833 Peel spoke wistfully of "the necessary unpopularity of all Government, particularly when Governments do their duty". He and the "liberal Tories" nevertheless recognized the force and liberal character of public opinion and hoped to be able to satisfy the more respectable classes and interests that helped compose it without subjecting Government altogether to its tyranny—"the worst evil with

which in the present state of the world", said Southey in his *Colloquies,* "civilized society is threatened". Whether they ever could have succeeded we shall never know, for the Whigs ousted them in 1830 and admitted, with many but, as the Tories ceaselessly pointed out, ultimately valueless qualifications, that Government was rather to follow than to ignore the approval of the public.

This shift of principle is well enough known. What is not generally appreciated is the significance it had for the established church. It had been a cardinal point of the theory of the old constitution that the establishment stood in an authoritative relation towards the people, preferably popular with them, but if not—*tant pis pour eux.* It existed to serve and to help everybody, just as it helped and served Government; but it had a duty and a right to "reprove, and rebuke with all authority", and a claim on everybody's pocket for support. People might not like paying, but *not one* had a right to be let off. Dissenters had long enjoyed religious liberty and almost complete civil equality; but the latter did not mean absolute equality with dutiful members of the establishment or exemption from the common responsibility to keep up the national church. An established church by definition was everybody's church. Let any class or interest contract out, and even though it stayed formally exactly the same, an established church of the ancient kind it was no longer. That is why the dissenters' sudden rise to real permanent political importance in 1831–2 made so many churchmen exclaim "The church is finished!" and why good Archdeacon Goddard told his bishop that the principle of church rates was "no other than the principle on which the Establishment rests". No wonder they fought so long and hard to keep them!

The constitutional revolution thus hit the establishment all along the water-line. Once it was over and irrevocable, by 1833, the establishment was still afloat and to outward appearances remarkably the same, but bereft of its anchors and rudder, waiting in the sultry calm to see what wind would blow and whether it could safely make any harbour. How to survive at all was one of the questions that worried the establishment's supporters; whether they could ever again rest upon a principle as clear as theirs had been before 1828, was the other.

The men of the Oxford Movement were not long troubled by the second question, anyway. They quickly found a fine new principle of a different kind, wedded to which they could cheerfully do without establishment if necessary. Newman, Froude and Pusey were all young and bold and their high churchism was untamed by the deep reverence for establishment that marked their likeliest allies, the "Hackney Phalanx"—H. J. Rose, H. H. Norris, the Watsons and so on. "Keble and his Oxford friends", complained Rose late in 1833, "go *so far* in the right course as to become wrong. . . ." The Oxford-Hackney alliance quickly broke down; the Hackney high-and-drys lingered shiv'ring on the brink, and fear'd to launch away.

But to most churchmen, valuing establishment for various and mixed reasons, the question could not be as simply solved. What did

establishment mean now that the constitution had changed so much? Every variety of answer was given. It was discovered by painful experience that although everyone wanted to know just what the church now meant to the state, no one explanation proved generally acceptable. The connexion between the established church and the state became uncertain and fluid.

One thing at once became clear to the establishment men. They had to fight their enemies in open ground. Fighting the church's political enemies was nothing new; but it was new to be facing a dynamic, radical and often very clever attack on several fronts without either a barrier of (allegedly) fundamental laws and principles between you and your enemies or the influence of the administration wholly on your side. Melbourne and Russell would obviously not go out of their way to back the church against the dissenters, and Peel, who would have liked to help, felt insuperable difficulties in the way of doing so. Governments tended more and more to let church, chapel, and papist fight it out between them. Keble acutely saw this free-for-all coming, and said so in the Advertisement prefixed to his famous sermon; "the Apostolic Church in this realm", he said, "is henceforth only to stand, in the eyes of the State, as *one sect among many*, depending, for any pre-eminence she may still appear to retain, merely upon the accident of her having a strong party in the country. . . ."

This being the case (and what a change it was from the good old days just six years deceased!) it behoved churchmen to fight lustily for their cause and to make it as strong, plausible and popular as they could. Thus all the addresses and declarations, the petitioning and pressure-grouping, that marked the next half-century; thus the boldness of language, the certainty of tone, as if there could be no doubt about it. The revolution left establishment men with a weak hand and gave the dissenters the political initiative. Churchmen that had it in them to fight (there seems to have been no lack of such) had to fight hard, holding on to all the rights, privileges and properties they could, and claiming as much more as could plausibly be claimed. If the dissenters disagreed, then let them try to enforce *their* view of the case. Neither side could any longer get a certain answer from the statute book to questions about the establishment. The best they could do was to appeal to the public, make the most of every advantage that history and social circumstance gave them, and see who could shout the loudest.

It was not, however, the public at large that could settle doubts about the establishment's position; it was—as in England it always is, in the end—parliament, mainly because it was there that the government's policy could best be examined and debated. When all else was confusion, the extent to which Government actually proposed to trust or honour the church was bound to be the most fruitful starting point for discussions about establishment, and would for some people be taken for a definitive statement. Dissenters liked to insult the establishment as a "parliamentary church" and a "political church". They meant to infer that it was founded by act of parlia-

ment (a statement to which good historical objections could be made) and that it dirtied its hands with unreligious work (a statement that rested wholly on voluntarist premises). But their descriptions of it were correct enough in another sense. If its establishment was to involve some real measure of co-operation with the state, its constitutional position must depend on parliament; and this meant that its position must be worked out by the common processes of politics, by the give-and-take, the assessment of possibilities, the eye on the next election, by which parliamentary politicians habitually work. In some measure this had always been the case, but before the revolution only in qualified and half-concealed ways. After the revolution it became, suddenly, quite naked.

That these were indeed the conditions under which the English connexion of church and state would henceforth have to be maintained—and very unsettling they were to men who knew what Erastus stood for—was rubbed in by the churchmen's likeliest champion in Government, Sir Robert Peel. If not from the leader of the Conservative party, from whom could the established church expect succour and support? But it was Peel and none other who had begun the revolution by pursuing "expediency" and "bowing to clamour" in 1828 and 1829; and it was Peel again who, after the revolution, and with the best interests of the church at heart, came out in favour of moderate reform in church and state, admitted that *something* had to be done to the Irish establishment, and actually did something effective for the English by setting up the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. At the same time he admitted that the dissenters had at least some justification in opposing any further official exaltations of the establishment and in declining to go on helping to pay for it. He did not get the kick out of these admissions that establishment Whigs got, because the end of the old-style establishment seemed to him the beginning of the end of Christian civilization; but "the greatest member of parliament that ever lived" (which is what Disraeli called him) knew better than anyone else just what could and what could not be managed in parliament. Like his great compeer, Bishop Blomfield (to whose character his own bore a strong similarity, and with whom he co-operated cordially in his church reform measures), he told the ultras and dogmatists who criticized him for lack of principle that a man would be a fool now not to "look to the consequences". As Melbourne's decrepit administration ground towards its halt, Conservative churchmen grew noticeably bolder in stating the establishment's claims, and looked forward to making something of them as soon as Peel was back in office. But those who knew Peel best knew better. Shaftesbury in July 1841, suspicious of what he called Peel's "love of expediency" and "his dread of an immoveable principle", feared "that it may not please God to render Peel an instrument of good to the nation". During that administration (1841–6) Peel did his best for the establishment, but angered his fiercer allies as much as the dissenters by seeking to push it along a middle course between the line to which its own rights would, in happier political circumstances, have entitled it, and the line to which the dissenters'

rights in the existing political circumstances limited it. The question always in his mind was, What will circumstances allow us to do for the established church? The question that consequently bothered churchmen was, How far can we go in the way of compromise with the state and with these unhappy circumstances?

There is no room here to describe even briefly how church reformers in Government and church reformers in the church set about "re-establishing" the establishment in early Victorian England, and how it survived in the battle with the dissenters (whose hostility towards it, so alarming in the early 'thirties, was nothing compared to what it became in the course of the 'forties) and with political circumstances so difficult and unsettling. It was a lively battle fought on several fronts. With church reform and extension I shall deal largely in the history of Queen Anne's Bounty and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners I expect to publish next year; and W. L. Mathieson's *English Church Reform,* 1815–40, will always remain useful. A huge amount has yet to be done on the relations of church and chapel, not only in national politics and "political theology", but even more as those relations actually were in the social life and thought of particular communities. W. G. Addison's *Religious Equality in Modern England,* 1714–1914, a fair and compendious survey of most of the topics involved, goes nowhere near far enough.

It was over education that church and chapel became most bitterly opposed, and that establishment men became most excited. (We shall have a valuable book on this when the Reverend Barry Marshall publishes his thesis on "The Theology of Church and State in relation to the concern for popular education in England, 1800–70".) The establishment had lost (and England would be none the better for its having lost) first the power and then the right to guide the lives of English adults; but did that mean it had lost its rights as "the supreme instructress of the people" and its ancient responsibility to educate the citizens of to-morrow in good morals and socially safe principles? Many sensible men thought not, and in the 'thirties and 'forties made out elaborate claims for the establishment's retention in this field anyway of its ancient prerogative. But there were, as usual, all varieties of views on a matter so peculiarly important for church and state, and the question, How far can we go for the sake of practical good resulting? more persistently nagged churchmen in this connexion than in any other.

This question, indeed, has been nagging Church of England men ever since. It is inescapable when an establishment is as anomalous as the English one has been since 1828. The Irish Church Bill, of course, posed it pointedly, but it was the Act of 1828 that started the modern run of the question; and it is the perpetual recurrence of that question that makes the history of church and state in the early Victorian period so intriguing, and membership of the Church of England in at least one respect intellectually so stimulating.

G. F. A. Best.

"I Am" in the Gospels

At dinner one evening at the palace at Cuddesdon, Bishop T. B. Strong discoursed on the number of theological errors common in England which are due simply to the English versions of the Bible. I cannot remember that he mentioned the above words. But he very well might have done. "I am that I am" in Exod. 3. 14; in John several times "I am"; the one sounds like an echo of the other. But in his commentary on St John, Archbishop Bernard warns us against making too much of the apparent parallel. Reference to these passages in the Septuagint and the Greek Testament makes this clear. A literal translation of the Septuagint of Exod. 3. 14 would run, "And God said unto Moses, I am He Who Is; and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, He Who Is hath sent me unto you". The "He Who Is" is "Ho Ōn", which is reflected in the title of God in Revelation, "Who is, and was, and is to come". The "I am" is "ego eimi", and is identical with the "I am" so frequently on the lips of our Lord. And it is clear in the Septuagint that the important part of the divine name is not the "I am", but the "He who is" which the book of Revelation echoes. But, on the other hand, when we have got away from the idea that the "I am" in our Lord's mouth is the equivalent, or even a reminder, of the divine name in Exodus, we find that there are times when those two words in their context do contain a divine claim, or something near it. But that does not mean that we are to read such a claim into them every time they occur.

It has been maintained lately that when in John 6. 20 (Mark 6. 50 and Matt. 14. 27) our Lord, walking on the water, says to his disciples, "It is I", because his words literally translated seem to be "I am" (ego eimi), he was intending them to understand, not only "It's me, the Jesus whom you know", but "I AM (very God, the omnipotent)". But precisely this same "I am" is put into the mouth of the man born blind (John 9. 9) when the Jews were wondering whether he was the same man or another like him. He replied "I am (he)", or, more accurately, "I am I". (The "ego" is the predicate.) So our Lord also said, not "I am", but "I am I" (and not a spirit); in current parlance "It's me". It was characteristic of our Lord that his words and actions were always relevant to the situation. In this case the situation is that the disciples were rowing a heavy boat against a strong headwind. The boat is tossing, they are wet with spray and perspiration, the labour is wearing, and they seem to make no progress. Suddenly someone in the bows points behind them and says "Look". The rowers look up and the helmsman turns round. They cry out in fear and redouble their efforts, altering course to avoid this apparition which looks as if it will pass quite close to them (Mark). Then they hear the familiar cheerful voice, "It's me; don't be frightened". And immediately "they are willing to take him into the boat". They slacken their rowing and wait for Jesus to approach. Was that the time for him to awe his already frightened disciples by saying, "I am He, the great, the everlasting"? Or, indeed, were the

disciples in a state of mind, with the wind and the waves, and their exhaustion and their fear, to grasp scriptural references if he had made them? Enough for them that it was he, their beloved Master, and no spirit. Those who, according to St Matthew, worshipped and said, "Truly thou art a son of God", were "those in the boat", and may well have been servants, not disciples; and how much they meant by their words at this time may well be questioned.

That simple phrase "I am" seems to be capable of a whole world of different connotations according to its context. For its use with a predicate the reader may be referred to Bernard's commentary, Introd., pp. cxvi ff., where also plenty of parallels from the LXX are cited to show the close association of the phrase with divine claims, which may be similar to our Lord's "I am", where the predicate is expressed, as in "I am the bread of life".

In other passages the predicate can easily be understood from the context, and accordingly is generally supplied by the translators, either "he" or "Christ" (A.V.) being added in italics; but in the original there were only the same two words "I am". In John 4. 26 our Lord says "I that speak unto thee am (he)", i.e. the Messiah. (It is the same "ego eimi"). The meaning is clear from the words of the Samaritan woman. And similar to this is Mark 14. 62, where he replies "I am; and ye shall see the Son of Man", etc., to the High Priest's challenge, "Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" That this "I am" is no more than a clear and unflinching "Yes, I am the Christ" is confirmed by the parallels in the other Synoptics. For if the tradition of the Gospel had been that our Lord's answer had implied more than was contained in the High Priest's question, i.e. if his "I am" contained any implication that "I am more than the Christ; I am He, very God", it would be extremely unlikely that Matthew and Luke should have missed so important a point altogether. In Luke the parallel is "Ye say that I am", and in Matthew "Thou sayest" (Luke 22. 70 and Matt. 26. 64), neither of which could be said to carry any fresh divine implication.

In John 8. 24 and 28 and in 13. 19 our Lord's use of "I am" seems to be exactly paralleled in his own words quoted in Mark 13. 6 (Luke 21. 8). In this passage he is foretelling that false prophets will arise and claim to be he (the one that is to come); in John, in 8. 24–5, he is telling the Jews that he truly is that one, and unless they realize it they will perish in their sins; while in 13. 19 he is reassuring the disciples, so that when the apparent disaster of his betrayal and death occurs, they may continue to believe that he is that Chosen One. The "I am" therefore in all these cases implies a predicate such as the translators have supplied, without defining precisely what that predicate is. And it is further significant that in both the latter passages, having uttered the words "I am", he forthwith reminds his hearers of his relation to him that sent him. So that, though the claim in these words is great, and is messianic, it is not necessarily divine, insomuch as it had not yet been revealed to the hearers that the Messiah is God himself incarnate; sufficient for the time being for them to accept him as the Messiah, who speaks the words of God.

It is now time to return to John 8. 58, "Before Abraham was, I am". We must remember Archbishop Bernard's warning: our Lord is not saying, or implying, "I am that I am". I find it impossible to believe that he ever could wish to imply such a thing of himself, or that John could wish to record him as having made such an implication. The whole of John's Gospel seems designed to show that he is the Son, the Word, eternal and fully divine, one with the Father, *but* eternally begotten, and eternally dependent on the Father, the eternal Obedience to the eternal Command. "I can of myself do nothing", "My teaching is not mine, but his that sent me", "I have not come of myself, but he sent me". For him to imply "I am that I am" of himself would be for him to confound the Begotten with the Begetter, the eternal Word with the eternal Source of Godhead. But all the same, short of this, in saying "Before Abraham was, I am", our Lord was claiming unmistakably at the least pre-existence with God, and at the most, as I think he intended his hearers to understand, eternal being with the Father.

There remains the "I am (he)" of the Garden of Gethsemane (John 15. 5–8). It has been suggested by commentators that it was the divine implication of these simple words that caused the soldiers and servants to fall back and bow to the ground. To one accustomed to Eastern manners it is amazing the difficulty which those words, "They went backward and fell to the ground", have caused to commentators, insomuch that Ellicott actually suggests that in retreating too suddenly the front ranks knocked over those behind them. There is no more need to suppose that they "fell" in the ordinary sense than to suppose that the dignified Jairus "fell" at his feet to plead for him to come and heal his daughter, or that Mary "fell" at his feet when he arrived after Lazarus' death. The soldiers fell back a pace or two and bowed down, knees and elbows touching the ground in frightened reverence. In the circumstances this was not at all unnatural without any particular show of divinity on the part of our Lord. In the eyes of the ordinary inhabitant of Palestine Jesus was a most unsafe person to molest. He could walk unharmed through the midst of an angry mob, and no one had the courage to be the first to touch him. The soldiers sent to arrest him in the Temple came back empty-handed. They had not dared. A man with his powers—why even I (who claim no particular supernatural powers) have known a man who thought he had incurred my displeasure, as he took his leave, say, "You won't utter a curse or anything, will you?" And on what else but the fear of his curse does the power of many an Eastern "holy man" rest? With a man of our Lord's known powers, when even James and John confidently expected to be told to call down fire on the contumacious Samaritan village, is it surprising that the ordinary uneducated soldiers and servants were afraid to lay hands on him? To the priests he was perhaps no more than a common revivalist, who was a nuisance and might be a danger. To the Pharisees he was a hated rival. But "the common people heard him gladly", and the servants were of the common people, and the soldiers, Jew or not, shared their super-

stitions. To them this Jesus was a most unsafe person to molest, and they did not in the least like these orders that they had been given to go and arrest him.

For all Judas' encouragement it is a very hesitant band that approaches Gethsemane. Our Lord sees them hanging on the outskirts of the garden. He goes forward to meet them. "Who are you looking for?" "Jesus of Nazareth." "I am he." At once they retreat and bow low to the ground, beseeching him by their attitude to spare them and not be angry: it is not their fault; they have to obey orders. Jesus repeats, "I told you, I am he", and wondering at their safety, they take him away. Then comes the trial before Caiaphas; and still nothing happens. Some bold person actually smacks his face, and still nothing happens. Why? He is harmless; he is safe! And their reaction from their fear expresses itself in the slappings and mocking and buffeting that he receives.

Jesus said "I am (he)". There is no need to suppose that there was any particular divine implication in his words to account for the fear of the soldiery. For such men in such an age it was quite natural. But to suppose that our Lord said "I am He (the Great One)" and then repeated "I told you I am He", purposely instilling terror into his enemies, neither suits the context, nor suits his own divine humility.

"I am": when we realize that the following word, "he" or "Christ", is not part of the original, our minds naturally begin to wonder whether it is connected with the great "I AM". This is where the English versions mislead us. The fact that St John puts the same phrase into the mouth of a blind beggar shows that in itself the phrase is entirely colourless. In our Lord's mouth, too, it could be so; or it could bear great weight, when the context implied a weighty predicate; and once our Lord used it absolutely with a very high significance; but never, I submit, sufficiently high to be written with capital letters "I AM".

✠ James, Bishop of East Bengal.

The Economy of a Parish Communion [1]

In 1594, Richard Hooker noted that Baptism initiates Christian life, of which Communion is the consummation. Moreover, the Book of Common Prayer displays Cranmer's intention that Sunday worship should move solemnly from "Morning Prayer", through "The Litany" and on into "Holy Communion". Moreover, just over fifty years ago, in his *Motu Proprio*, Pius X recognized that "active participation in the public and solemn prayer of the Church is the primary and indispensable source of a true Christian Spirit".

At St Wilfrid's, Halton, Leeds, we have found it possible to demon-

[1] An explanation of the morning service televised by the B.B.C. on Sunday, 23 November 1958.

strate these three features within the given economy of the Prayer Book. The work has been long, and a costly experience for the congregation. Of course the arrangements are not perfect, but from our struggle we have gained something valuable; valuable, because it is alive.

The service begins as the people enter through the porch. Here we see a pile of cut household bread, a bottle of wine from an off-licence, a list for our intercessions, and a plate for our money. Each takes a single small square from the pile and puts it into the ciborium at the side. So, no sooner has he entered, than each is faced with his responsibility to bring his own particular self to take part within the properly functioning community. Parents bring their children, who could have been baptized during a similar Communion service, and take them up to be blessed when they themselves receive the Bread and Wine.

When all is ready, two church wardens move from the porch to the vestry and request the entrance of the "Bible" procession by striking the floor with their staves. Whereupon a minister enters immediately into the midst of the people. He addresses them with the opening prayer of Mattins, "O Lord, open thou our lips!" to which the people respond, the introduction continuing until the *Venite*. In this way the opening of Mattins becomes involved as part of the preparation for Communion. The preparation for "Morning Prayer" is omitted because Mattins in this relationship to Communion does not itself need a preparation.

We then sing the *Venite*, while the ministers process from the nave door to their places. Within the liturgy this "Bible" procession is the formal response to the people's entrance. The procession is formed from those who will minister to the Church, each according to his own appointment and capacity: crucifer and servers, the choir, readers licensed to administer the chalice, any assistant priests, the wardens, and finally the celebrant, in his cope, holding the Bible aloft. At the chancel step stands the reading desk where the Bible rests, ready for the Old Testament reading, the Epistle, the Gospel and the Sermon, which are the Ministry of the Word and together make up the first part of the service.

The Ministry of the Word

After we have taken our places, everyone joins in the *Psalm* for the day. This brings a necessary and appropriately meditative calm after the introduction. Then, as the celebrant continues by reading the *Lord's Prayer*, the ancient service of Mattins and the beginning of the Synaxis coincide, and we hear our first intimation that the two services are wedded together and will lead us steadily through the celebration of the Word towards that of the Communion.

The Church then says together the *Collect for Purity*, and thus publicly acknowledges its need to prepare before the great historical drama unfolds. This response by the people to the celebrant's single recitation sets the rhythmical pattern which governs much of the

movement of the service. Indeed, it is by this rhythm that the Church becomes aware of its formal life together. The celebrant initiates a specific movement, which is taken up by another member of the Church whose ministry it is and to whom the rest respond as a body. Sometimes this "follow through" is swift and the response concentrated into a single "Amen". Sometimes, again, the celebrant seems to excite a series of echoes each received and transmitted into our corporate experience.

The feeling mounts, overflowing into the *Kyries,* themselves a prelude to the more solemn *Collects,* first for the Queen and then for the Day. A woman from among the people then takes the Bible from the desk to the lectern and reads the *Lesson* for the day, taken from the Old Testament. The minister of this reading is always a woman.

Our response is the *Te Deum,* which catches hold on the swelling theme to carry us along to the *Epistle,* read this time by a man. And the pattern is reproduced: he takes up the Bible and moves to the pulpit. The reading correlates the ascent of Mattins with that of the Synaxis towards their climax in the Gospel. The man's ministry is therefore appropriately sealed by the *Benedictus,* itself a song of satisfied yearning and undoubted promise.

A gospeller now takes up the ministry: first, the celebrant gives his solemn blessing to the reading; then the priest moves in procession with cross and lights into the chancel. As he has moved down towards the nave, so later the Offertory procession will move up to the altar-table.

As soon as the *Gospel* is read, the people at once respond with the *Creed*—a response to the Word at last fulfilled and now to be crystallized in the *Sermon.* During the Creed, the preacher mounts the pulpit. Before he leaves the chancel he picks up the Bible, from which he will read his text. And so we reach the Gospel, alive on the preacher's lips. After the Sermon, he puts the Bible back, open at the Gospel.

The altar-table has until now been quite bare. It is prepared for the Communion while the celebrant puts on his chasuble. Now we bring in the younger children from their crèche in the hall, while the assistant priest, accompanied by his procession of cross and lights, moves down the nave to collect the representatives of the people and their offerings. The wardens have brought these from the porch and now they lie on a table standing near the font.

The Ministry of the Sacrament

The Ministry begins with the *Offertory Procession.* The woman who has provided the bread carries the full ciborium, a man the wine, and a younger member the water. A sidesman brings up the money and the intercession list, while the two wardens bear the chalices. These are all received by the celebrant, who has taken his place behind the altar-table, facing his people. We find it valuable that the priest and people should meet across the table on which rests the very cause and strength of our unity. We have noticed, too,

that this position in practice emphasizes our presence at a divine meal, for, after he has distributed the bread and wine to his assistants, the celebrant sits down in a chair raised up in a central position behind the altar, as host and representative of the bishop, who would preside if present.

After its reception, the Offertory is sealed from this position by everyone saying together:

> All things come of thee, O Lord, and of thine own have we given thee.

Returning to the eastward position, the celebrant bids us pray for any particular needs according to the list given him, concluding with *Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth.* This is then continued in litany form by a priest, who pauses for a response at these points:

. . . unity and godly love.
. . . religion and virtue.
. . . holy sacraments.
. . . days of their life.
. . . other adversity.
. . . (end).

Each section concludes with "Lord, hear our prayer: And let our cry come unto thee!" The effect is exhilarating. It is as if the prayer moves carefully out from the sanctuary, growing all the time, gains full development in the chancel and passes broadcast to the people, who seal and return it to the minister.

In this way, Cranmer's original intention is subtly fulfilled with ease and propriety. The plan was, as we say, Mattins-Litany-Communion. And, so elaborately did he arrange for this, all three services, as printed later, overlapped each other within themselves. Our arrangement clears up this situation by providing, at the point we have now reached, a litany in the position it was intended The Litany should go—after the Ministry of the Word and before the invitation to the Ministry of the Sacrament. Moreover, our pattern emphasizes the Eucharist as the Great Litany of Intercession, Penitence and Thanksgiving.

The celebrant gives the *absolution,* and then moves round to the words "Draw near with faith . . .", the assistants leave their stalls to kneel before him on the altar step. The Church then makes its *confession,* the celebrant kneeling with his people. Yet again, a single voice has introduced a corporate movement, beginning at the sanctuary and spreading out into the nave.

The celebrant gives his *absolution,* and then moves round to the other side of the altar with assistants, while one of the people reads the *Comfortable Words* from a position within the body of the people. We find in this way that we attend to the background of the world's salvation—our unity in the Lord's Body, each member of which carries his neighbour's burdens.

Flanked by his assistants, the celebrant now continues through to the *Sanctus.* We have found it best to use a permanent Preface, com-

posed from those which the Prayer Book distributes over several special days:

> . . . because thou didst give Jesus Christ, thy only Son, to be born for us; who by the operation of the Holy Ghost, was made very man of the substance of the Virgin Mary his mother; and that without spot of sin to make us clean from all sin; for he is the very Paschal Lamb which was offered for us, and hath taken away the sin of the world; who by his death hath destroyed death, and by his rising again hath restored to us Everlasting Life; and ascended up into heaven to prepare a place for us; that where he is thither we might also ascend and reign with him in glory; therefore . . .

This we follow immediately with the *Prayer of Humble Access,* said by all together as a family prayer. The celebrant continues through the *Prayer of Consecration,* which the whole Church stamps as its own by adding "Amen" after the words of Institution. Then, after a definite pause, all continue together with the second section beginning, "Wherefore, O Lord, and heavenly Father, we . . .". So, once more, a single conductive voice began a movement which culminates in corporate action. The silence following the "Amen!" is a moving moment, and a signal mark of adoration. A silence can be no less "corporate" than any shout, so that from the people's opening seal to the close of their prayer, the altar seems surrounded by the whole Church in action. Indeed, we note this by grouping the celebrant with his assistants as a symbol of our responsible participation.

And so this is a fitting moment for the *Kiss of Peace.* We represent it at Halton in this way:

> *Celebrant:* Pray for the person on your Left!
> (*Pause*)
> Pray for the person on your Right!
> (*Pause*)

And then the *Agnus,* while the celebrant and his assistants communicate. The celebrant then gives them the Bread and Wine, and himself takes the bishop's seat behind the altar facing the *Communion.* Here he presides while his people receive the Bread and Wine and bring up their children to be blessed.

After the Communion, the celebrant moves to the front of the altar and the whole Church together says the *Lord's Prayer,* to which the celebrant responds with the *Prayer of Thanksgiving.* In its turn, this bursts into the *Gloria.* Then, the *Blessing,* the assistants still up before the altar, after which they all accompany the celebrant in procession with the choir to the nave door.

At the door, the procession halts, the people kneel and the service ends with:

> *Celebrant:* The Lord be with you!
> *People:* And with thy spirit!
> *Celebrant:* Let us bless the Lord!
> *People:* Thanks be to God!
> *Celebrant:* Let us go forth in peace!
> *People:* In the name of Christ! Amen.

Thus the rhythmical pattern of ministry, sustained throughout the service, draws to a close, and no single part or function remains isolated from the rest. It can be seen how liturgical strength may be gained from a pattern of response. Moreover, we do not encourage the people to remain behind in the building, but to leave at once. *Ite, missa est* is thus recognized and the service takes a proper place as a power house of mission to the rest of the world.

What is important about these arrangements is not whether there are some mistakes of method or faults in doctrine, but that they are an example of what we should all be doing—trying to fashion a liturgy to express the Word of God in the midst of our changing needs. We were compelled to go to work because we saw so much hidden treasure in the past and longed to bring it to light.

Ernest W. Southcott and Bernard Mayes.

Letter from Japan

THE CHALLENGE OF THE "APRÈS GUERRE" CLERGY IN THE N.S.K.K.

As the Nippon Sei Ko Kai approached the celebrations for the centenary of non-Roman missionary activity in Japan, it was natural that there should be some measure of self-examination and self-criticism. (I am writing this, as will appear, before the celebrations take place.) To many the N.S.K.K. has seemed to be little more than a select, self-congratulatory club rather than a living fellowship, conscious of its vocation to evangelistic witness and to the transmission of the life-giving and life-transforming power of the Gospel to every department of Japanese society. Often the Church has seemed to be little conscious of the fact that Christians of any denomination formed little more than half of one per cent of the population. It has seemed to be inward-looking rather than outward-looking. The centenary celebrations, as planned, seemed to be little more than one glorious "Banzai!"[1]

It is in this context that there has emerged the voice of discontent and of challenge from the younger clergy, who are now becoming numerically strong as the theological colleges send forth their men year by year. There are, of course, the usual dangers that can accompany any such movement—particularly that its criticism be negative and that it acts for divisiveness and not for unity in the life of the Church. But the present writer is hopeful that the dissatisfaction with the *status quo* will lead to a brighter future.

A group sent out an appeal to their fellow-clergy in December 1958, and, as a result, there has been serious study in a number of the dioceses, and a paper is being put out to form a forum for free discussion and mutual criticism. This paper will have the support

[1] The Japanese equivalent for "three cheers".

of a number of the older clergy, too, and it is hoped that some of the issues raised will be brought up at the 26th General Convention of the Church, which will be held on 9–11 April, following the main centenary celebrations on 7 and 8 April.

The appeal touched upon the following points:

1. *What is the relation between the Church and Society?* It was strongly felt that the whole approach to the Christian faith was over-individualistic, and that no message was being conveyed to the non-Christian cultural environment within which the Church is living. The Church is not meant to be of the world, but the corollary to that is certainly not that the Church is to neglect the world or its obligation towards society. There was a call for the formation of a study commission to examine more closely the nature of Japanese society, and particularly Christian responsibility within it. There was need, it was asserted, to consider the extent to which the Church must be ready to make pronouncements on social or political issues.

2. *What is the relationship between the clergy and laity?* It was felt that, up to the present, the authority of the ministry was far too often expressed as clerical authoritarianism, and that far more thought needs to be given to the ministry of the laity. The Church was not only making inadequate use of its laity, but also was vague on the function women workers were to perform in its life. Far too often women workers in Japan are treated as though they were office servants, and are given little responsibility. (Perhaps it is not only Japan where the clergy think that they must have everything securely in their own hands!)

3. *On the problem of self-support.* With China just over the water, it is natural that the Church should be considering the three selfs. At the moment there is little consideration of the possibilities of a working ministry or the use of "local" priests—i.e. men who continue in their secular occupation, but are ordained to the priesthood for the service of the local congregation which could not give full economic support to a full-time stipendiary priest. There were doubts thrown on whether foreign aid was being used with the effectiveness that it might be, and the need for an over-all strategy was emphasized. Whereas the older clergy remember the days of mission control and widespread economic aid, the younger clergy are more conscious of the need for self-support and, furthermore, did not experience the war years, when the clergy suffered intense hardship and when some felt it was the priest's part to refuse secular occupation even to the point of starvation. Japan's place in the world-wide fellowship of the Anglican communion needs to be thought out more clearly, and the true meaning and practical implementation of interdependence.

4. *The place of the missionary.* To quote one of the younger clergy (still a deacon): "It is high time to re-evaluate realistically the merits of the missionaries, and ask whether we need their continued help. If we think we do, we must be sure that we know why; we must be aware of our theological presuppositions. Furthermore, we must ask ourselves what part they are to play in the developing

Japanese Church, and where they can be most effectively located. A haphazard use of missionaries as a mere stop-gap system or their use for merely economic reasons (e.g. as free professors or teachers) is hardly to be commended."

5. *The place of our Christian institutions.* There is no merit in hanging on to institutions if the situations which created them or which they were created to serve no longer obtain. We must ask ourselves what are the principles underlying their use. Even if it be posited that our schools and social institutions have exercised a Christian influence or created a Christian atmosphere, we must distinguish between a Christian atmosphere and Christianity itself. And, further, the suggestion is made—not without truth—that there is a tendency to confuse Christianization and westernization.

6. *The need for an effective publications program.* The N.S.K.K. is lamentably weak on a publications side, and the younger clergy were pushing for a systemic plan. Books are put out almost by chance, and the same is often true of books chosen to be translated. Far more concrete consideration of the needs of the Church in this matter is called for. (I would add that this might be a point at which sister churches overseas could well lend a hand. The major problems relating to the economic basis of the Church's organization very often tend to shut out the suggestion of budgets for publications, but in a 98 per cent literate country the use of the written word is obviously demanded. It may be added, too, that—apart from the Lutherans—it is mainly the Fundamentalist groups in Japan who are making extensive use of radio and other means of mass communication.)

7. *The pattern of Church organization.* Here there is widespread criticism, and the feeling that patterns of parochial life have been introduced which have no relevance for the Japanese scene. The criticism is occasionally made—and it can be well corroborated at times by looking at the pattern of church life—that the missionary has given us the parish instead of the church. In other words, the system introduced is often too static. There is plenty of organization and also a systematic Canon Law, but evidences of the dynamic thrust of the koinonia are all too infrequent.

R. J. Hammer.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Right Rev. W. P. Gilpin has been Bishop of Kingston-upon-Thames since 1952.

Dr Best is a Fellow of Trinity Hall, Cambridge.

The Right Rev. J. D. Blair has been Bishop of East Bengal since 1951.

The Rev. E. W. Southcott is Vicar, and the Rev. B. Mayes Assistant Curate, of St Wilfrid's Church, Halton, Leeds.

The Rev. R. J. Hammer is a Professor at the Central Theological College, Tokyo, and Lecturer in Christian Doctrine at St Paul's University.

CORRESPONDENCE

TRAINING FOR THE MINISTRY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Mr Tyler complains that those who write on the question of training for the ministry are not in the work for which the work is designed. May one who has, but for three and a half years when he was testing his vocation for the religious life, spent thirty-eight years in the ministry and in parochial work in this country and in India, venture to draw his attention to certain things about the training for the ministry.

I noticed before I was ordained, and was serving in War No. 1, that the most efficient clergy I had ever met were those who had been trained at Kelham. As army chaplains they were head and shoulders above the "Dons" of Cambridge and Oxford, who provided most of the chaplains in the division in which I served for two years. I have noticed that Kelham-trained clergy are, as a rule, excellent parish priests, and seem able to cope with working in uncongenial places and can face "the weight of modern secularism".

I went to Cuddesdon in 1920 and learned there two lessons of real value—to live a disciplined life and meditate on Holy Scripture each morning. The discipline at Cuddesdon was not as strict at that time as it became afterwards under Bishop Eric Graham. This, I think, was a weakness in the rule of Bishop James Seaton, but, on the other hand, missionary vocations were so fostered there that by 1925 half of those who were there with me in 1920–1 were overseas.

I am convinced that unless clergy have a vision of the value of living a disciplined life and have learned to pray they can make no impression on this "naughty world". The great value of a theological college is not the theology that it teaches, but that the students come out of the world for a short period and spend a time on "a holy hill'. The world will press on them hard enough during the rest of their lives.

A theological college cannot teach pastoral theology; this can only be learned in the period when one is a deacon, and unfortunately only too often, because of the shortage of clergy, deacons are not being trained by their vicars properly. I would add that (i) I have not come across any good book on pastoral theology since those written by Canon Peter Green, and these are quite out of date. (ii) Things learned in one's first parish do not necessarily work in another. (iii) Countrymen make the best country clergy, and, if possible, men at the closing years of their ministry should not move from town work to a country parish.

Finally, Mr Knapp-Fisher's attitude to the spiritual life happens to be the right one; it is one that works.

Yours faithfully,
A. C. B. MOLONY.

THE VICARAGE,
GREAT GIDDING,
HUNTINGDON.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Would it be possible for training for the ministry to be arranged on lines resembling the "sandwich courses" which obtain in many industries? I can foresee practical difficulties, but if these could be overcome I think that great gains might ensue. I should like to see some ordinands at least made deacons after one year at a theological college, and sent to work as assistant curates for six months. They would then return to college for two terms before being priested. After working as priests for a year, they might again return for six months' further training.

I make this suggestion because I feel that under the present system there is an inevitable gulf between what the ordinand is taught and the life he will actually have to live. At the level of pastoralia, this may not matter so much, since one can soon adapt the teaching received in college to the requirements of the parish to which one goes. The tragedy is that the connexion between instruction in doctrine and devotion on the one hand and parish life on the other is not so easily made. A return to college, as a curate of a particular parish, might provide the necessary stimulus and opportunity.

Yours, etc.,

THE GOOD SHEPHERD VICARAGE,
ROCHDALE, LANCS.

H. J. M. TURNER.

UNCHRISTIAN LITURGY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

An addendum to support Lady Oppenheimer's letter in your April issue. The grammatical meaning of "Let your light so shine . . . that they may see", read as an isolated text apart from its context, is that we should let our light shine *in such a way that* it may be seen, which is the very opposite of our Lord's teaching. But in the context of the preceding verse it is clear that *so* means "like a candle on a candlestick". Our Lord teaches that we must not deliberately make a show of our good works, but also that we must not timorously conceal them. The former is hypocrisy and does harm: the latter is courage and does good.

Matt. 5. 16 is not a good Offertorium.

Yours faithfully,

12, PALMEIRA COURT,
HOVE.

✠ KENNETH MACKENZIE.

"JUNG AND THE PROBLEM OF EVIL"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

In his review of my *Jung and the Problem of Evil*, Mr Philip Mairet begins by referring to my "defence of the doctrine of the

negativity of evil", which is not correct, for I do not defend the negativity of evil at all (and, incidentally, I do not like the *privatio boni* referred to in those terms, and I point this out quite clearly in the chapter I wrote on this subject). My short chapter on the *privatio boni* (13 pages only) deals with Jung's extensive treatment of the subject and his serious misunderstanding of its meaning. And of course I was quite correct in stating that the doctrine of the *privatio boni* is not a necessary article of faith. I am also amazed at your reviewer's assertion that it would have been more effective to deal with Jung's view of the Quaternity and the treatment of theism in "Answer to Job", because that is exactly what I do and, in fact, write on this at several times the length I did on the *privatio boni*. There is a chapter on Satan (26 pages), one on the Quaternity (15 pages), and my treatment of "Answer to Job" runs to 76 pages. I cannot think that your reviewer can have read my book sufficiently to justify his attempting to review it. If he did, what can explain this incredible amnesia? Incidentally, your reviewer has not grasped, or appears entirely to have lost sight of, Jung's answer to my question about evil, for in this much of his reply is concerned with the *privatio boni*, which obviously could not be ignored in our subsequent correspondence.

There is also surely no excuse for Mr Mairet's uncertainty about whether Jung's letters given in my book had been published elsewhere or not. In large and clear print there is the statement on the cover: "This correspondence is here published for the first time and Jung's own contribution amounts to a large part of the book."

Mr Mairet also wrenches out of its context a part of a sentence on page 185 and quotes me as saying that consciousness "cannot be completely explored". What I actually said was not so simple: "If consciousness is of this nature (i.e. having transcendental borders) it is obvious that it cannot be completely explored, and this emphasizes once again that the process of individuation is always a continuing one." The "this nature" relates to the previous sentence, which refers to Niebuhr's treatment of the place of consciousness in *The Self and the Dramas of History*.

There are many other points in the review which I should have liked to have referred to, but understandably space is not available for the full answer I should like to make.

Ramsbury Vicarage,
Marlborough, Wilts.

Yours faithfully,
Howard Philp.

BOOK REVIEWS

Commentary on the Sunday Lessons. (New Lectionary, Year One.) By Eric W. Heaton. Longmans. 25s.

Few parts of the structure of the Church are in greater need of repair than the bridge between the academies and the parishes. Thus any work undertaken with that aim must occasion rejoicing and

hope, and the first thing to be said about this book is that both the nature of the enterprise, and the author's handling of it, show an understanding of the position of those who, amid a plethora of other demands, preach to the same congregations Sunday by Sunday, which is seldom to be discovered outside the ranks of those who are experiencing it. So accustomed do parish clergymen become to having their lack of intellectual attainment and erudition deplored from the abstruse mazes in which their critics seem at times to them to dwell that it would be difficult more to discourage them from study. But here is one who holds out exactly the helping hand which they need, and it is pleasantly fitting that he should be Chancellor of a cathedral. Is it possible that in the remote age when cathedral schools preceded the as yet unborn universities wisdom in being more diocesanly located was more widely diffused? Be that as it may, the present Chancellor of Salisbury Cathedral has done far more than write a book. He has set an example, and not least an example of altruistic industry.

Nothing adds more to the travail of writing than the attainment of brevity. This is a packed book, yet in spite of that, perhaps because of that, it is written in pleasant straightforward English prose. It is, too, exactly what it calls itself—a commentary. No ready-made sermons will be found in it, but it will not only set a host of sermons moving; it will preserve them from straying from the texts which they set out to expound and from attaching to those texts opinions and speculations of the preacher which they will not bear. Not that it will be to preachers only that this book will prove a godsend. We know of nothing which could more usefully be recommended to one who, though seriously intelligent, has not opportunity for extended study and who wishes to read the Bible under the guidance of current scholarship. Into the Sunday lectionary which, new though this one may be, is not in essentials the creation of yesterday have presumably been gathered those passages on which the wisdom of the Church considers that public attention had best be concentrated. To the educated layman who asks, "How shall I set to work to read the Bible?" one may answer, "Read these", and then urge him to invest in this commentary as well-invested a 25s. as he has ever expended. It is not in these days as great a sum as it will at first sound to him! The very nature of the work guarantees that a large and inclusive field is covered, but it is covered here by means of such well-thought-out exposition and such apt quotations, culled from a wide range of reading, that the task is fulfilled with outstanding adequacy.

It is, however, to the preacher striving to preach faithfully out of the appointed Scriptures that it will prove the greatest boon. There will be those who will fear that he may use it as persons preparing for examinations sometimes use the convenient digests provided for them by kindly authors. Actually this book is so enticingly written as to encourage wider investigations, but such a conspectus as it provides is surely a thing properly to be welcomed by those whose reading cannot, for all that is said to them in what is a little grandiloquently called post-ordination training and at conferences, be other

than limited both in scope and duration. Though they may not be *Stupor Mundi*, they need not leave the world wondering, and here they will find a deal of just that clarification which the discipline of preaching on the Lessons demands. It is one of the incidental benefits of the wide revival of that good habit, which this book has it as one of its purposes to encourage, that the preacher is compelled to address his mind to passages the meaning of which he might otherwise be content to continue to suppose that more learned heads than his understand. So too, though there are those who can turn almost any text to their predilections, whether it be "our catholic heritage" or the evils of gambling, the congregation will generally be preserved from too narrow and selective a presentation of the Christian faith. Particularly we wish, since they must be particularly hard-pressed, that this book might be put into the hands of all the readers, who increasingly Sunday by Sunday up and down the country, exercise already the part-time ministry without which the services of the Church could not be maintained. Such help can hardly be less needed by them now than when at length by logical conclusion this part-time ministry receives the recognition and gift of ordination. For a diocese to provide all its readers with books such as this might well prove a more profitable outlay than to mortgage its resources from above for the years ahead to maintain educational projects of which, whatever their theoretical promise, the cost has become vastly more evident than the results.

Nobody is likely to find himself agreeing with everything in a book of this kind. One may dislike the Second Sunday in Advent being called "Bible Sunday", only less than one dislikes the Fourth Sunday in Advent being turned into Carol Sunday. One may think it unduly fanciful to have Paul's mind harking back in 1 Cor. 15. to 1 Cor. 12, when he himself betrays no sign that it did so. Often of late one may have found oneself wondering whether the writers of the New Testament books were so ingenious at concealing their meanings as some of our present-day detectives prove themselves at times in showing that they were. But a representative book, such as this is, ought to be representative, and it is not because we think that it will soon be dated that we found ourselves feeling that it would be interesting to read it a hundred years from now. Certainly a mid-twenty-first century author of a book called "Biblical Theology in the middle of the Twentieth Century" would find both an able and a singularly comprehensive basis for his study here. Meanwhile, we hope that the book will find a place in many book shelves side by side with Revised Standard Version and Cruden. The quotations from Scripture in it are from the former, by the increasing adoption of which for public reading in worship we are ceasing to have the living God address us out of a literary museum.

FRANK BENNETT.

MAIDSTONE.

Documents from Old Testament Times. Edited by D. Winton Thomas. Nelson. 18s.

Illustrations from Biblical Archaeology. By D. J. Wiseman. Tyndale Press. 12s. 6d.

Documents from Old Testament Times is a volume by members of the Society for Old Testament Study and is the fourth of a series published by the society. It consists of translations, with introductions and commentary, of a number of archaeological texts from the Old Testament period. An attempt has been made to discuss each document from the point of view of the Old Testament, especially with regard to questions of history, religion and literature. Hence, although most of these documents are to be found in the American publication *Ancient Near Eastern Texts,* the great merit of the present work is that such documents are presented with particular reference to the Old Testament. Some twenty scholars contribute to the volume, which is edited and introduced by Prof. Winton Thomas. Comprising cuneiform, Egyptian, Moabite, Hebrew and Aramaic texts, it thus contains material ranging from the Babylonian Epic of creation to the Elephantine Papyri.

Of particular interest is J. V. Kinnear Wilson's treatment of the Babylonian cosmogonic and flood stories, although it will appear strange to many that the Babylonian creation "epic has no connections of any kind or at any point with Genesis" (p. 14). C. J. Mullo Weir presents an equally interesting and instructive treatment of the Tell El-Amarna Letters, while the Ras Shamra Tablets are profitably discussed by J. Gray. The selection of the Assyrian and Babylonian historical records handled by D. J. Wiseman provides a most valuable background to the narratives of Kings. Inscriptions relating to the western campaigns of Assyrian monarchs from the ninth century onwards serve to illumine many obscure biblical references. Recently discovered texts from the Babylonian Chronicle likewise throw light on much of the period of the Neo-Babylonian Dynasty, and documents relating to the fall of Nineveh and the battle of Carchemish (605) are among those offered here. There is also inscriptional evidence for the movements of the Babylonian armies immediately subsequent to Carchemish, and Wiseman maintains that Jehoiakim submitted to Nebuchadrezzar at this time. Especially significant is a record informing us that Jerusalem was captured by the Babylonians on 16 March 597 B.C., thus providing us with a definite date for both Judean and Babylonian chronology. The Lachish Letters shed further light on the political and military situation in Judah round the year 590, and D. Winton Thomas deals with this material. Selecting three letters for translation and commentary he makes some enlightening remarks on their contents and implications.

Limitations of space forbid reference to the many other documents similarly treated in this book, but an indication of its value may be gained from those mentioned. The volume is admirably conceived and produced, and it may be justly claimed that it represents an epoch in British Old Testament scholarship.

In *Illustrations from Biblical Archaeology*, D. J. Wiseman surveys the archaeological material which has a bearing on the Bible from the earliest times to the New Testament. He also offers a helpful account of the aims and methods of present-day excavations and provides a number of interesting photographs and illustrations. In addition to commenting on familiar material, he brings to our notice some significant recent discoveries. We find, for example, that a fragment of the Epic of Gilgamesh recently found at Megiddo shows that the epic was known in Palestine in the fourteenth century B.C. We read, too, that Jericho probably fell to the armies of Joshua in the thirteenth century and not, as Garstang thought, in 1407. Again, we learn that Nabonidus was compelled to flee from Babylon to Arabia because of his religious views. Written for the student rather than the scholar the work is somewhat compressed in places, but it is a valuable guide to modern biblical archaeology and in itself constitutes a reliable sketch of the history of Israel.

C. F. Whitley.

University College, Bangor.

Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem. A Study of the Teaching of Saint Luke. By Adrian Hastings. Longmans. 16s.

Luke's Witness to Jesus Christ. By R. H. Fuller. Lutterworth Press. 2s. 6d.

We have learnt in the last twenty years to think in terms of the "sub-structure of New Testament theology", but this must be balanced by a study of the way in which each gospel writer chooses to preach the one Gospel. In the case of St Luke, this has been encouraged in recent years by the appearance of a full-scale English commentary (A. R. C. Leaney), several essays and articles (e.g. in *Studies in the Gospels*), and now by "A Study of the Teaching of Saint Luke", which is the sub-title of the first book to be considered here.

To the Anglican reader this book is doubly interesting. It is interesting in itself as a stimulating contribution to the study of the gospel traditions known and related by St Luke in the third gospel and in the Acts of the Apostles, and this is particularly true of the examination of the way in which Luke delineates Jesus "as a prophet—*the* prophet" (p. 62). But, because the author is a Roman Catholic, the book is even more interesting as a revelation of the possibility of a new approach to scientific biblical study at least within certain circles of the Roman Church. The author is clearly *au fait* with, and sympathetic towards, much of the work done by non-Roman Catholic biblical scholars, and has obviously been influenced by such writers as C. H. Dodd and A. M. Ramsey, to mention just two.

He nowhere explicitly claims that St Mark was the first written gospel, but a statement like "Among the synoptics the focal point is undoubtedly Mark and after him Matthew" (p. 2) clearly suggests that he accepts this critical conclusion. He has clearly, too, gained a

good deal from Form Criticism; for instance he can write, "Before the gospels there was the Gospel" (p. 5). Again, his view of the nature of the fourth gospel and its relationhip to the synoptics is anything but that of the rather narrow fundamentalism that one has come to associate, erroneously in some cases it appears, with the average post-Modernist Roman Catholic view of the Bible. Indeed, the author goes further than many biblical critics have in the past when he makes the illuminating suggestion that Luke's writings stand apart somewhat from Mark and Matthew, and ought to be treated as "a bridge between the earlier gospels and St John" (p. 2). This remark is illuminating as a contribution to serious biblical study, but is even more important because it suggests a much more positive approach to biblical study than one had thought possible in the Roman Church of to-day. If it were not for the unfamiliar spelling of Old Testament names, the fairly frequent quotation of French Roman Catholic writers, and an occasional dogmatic emphasis in dealing with a subject like the Apostolic succession (p. 93), one might well think that this book had been written by a nonconformist biblical scholar. This, surely, is a fact for which we should be very thankful.

The second book, more modest in its aim, is also about St Luke. It is a short commentary on the English text by Prof. Fuller in the "World Christian Books" series. The difficulties of writing an adequate commentary in so short a space (80 pages) are obvious, but Prof. Fuller does more than merely give an outline or paraphrase. He is concerned throughout to give an exposition of the Gospel as St Luke preached it. He provides a short critical introduction which deals briefly with such questions as the authorship, date, and sources of St Luke's gospel. A book of this size cannot deal with problems that interest the specialist biblical student, but, then, the book is clearly not written for them. It is written for the intelligent layman who wants to be able to read his Bible better and to make use of the insights of biblical scholars.

KELHAM. SIMON MEIN, S.S.M.

THE BELIEF OF CHRISTENDOM. By John Burnaby. National Society and S.P.C.K. 17s. 6d.

This is a lucid and most readable commentary on the Nicene Creed. Hitherto handbooks on Christian doctrine have been more frequently based on the Apostles' Creed. Now Prof. Burnaby has given us something distinctive and sorely needed in this reasoned examination of the subtler phrases of a conciliar statement of faith. With scholarly popularization and a skilful translation of technical terms, he presents material which should prove most serviceable to teachers in schools and colleges when faced with hard questions in apologetics; it is also a book designed to interest the growing number of theologically alert laity. The author's learning is evident throughout, yet never paraded. He succeeds in dealing with a subject, such as Arianism, without furnishing the dreary details of the controversy and without including the maze of names and dates which the theo-

logical student must disentangle. But there is no trace of superficiality; he writes not to modernize, but rather to be understood. It is true that he administers a slight shock when he states that the much-disputed term *Homoousios* ("of one substance") really adds nothing to the creed; for he maintains that what the word meant never could be stated more clearly than in the simple "Very God of very God". Yet the shock serves to demonstrate to the reader how uncomfortable the mysteries of the faith find themselves in the words which clothe them.

Prof. Burnaby's aim is eirenic; he has included the word "Christendom" in his title with this purpose in view. Yet when he expounds differences in the Protestant and Catholic approach to points of doctrine, he does not blur the divergencies, but succeeds in treating objectively matters which too often have been coloured by emotion and strife. His section on the various meanings of "faith" provides an excellent example of his gift for interpretation. His style and choice of words enable the reader, who has no knowledge of the background, to understand the essentials of the issues involved. The book, as a result, will help the reader to sift theological from political and cultural issues in the history of divided Christendom.

The treatment of Scripture is convincing and attractive. When a patristic scholar of Prof. Burnaby's eminence makes clear the limitations of much of the text-slinging in the early days of creed-making, we are the more ready to learn from him of the importance of thinking biblically about the dogmatic statements of the Christian Church. Thus we discover the link between the Scriptures and the Church in the wholeness of their teaching about God and man. If occasionally in this credal commentary the explanation of a doctrine appears to be too short to be entirely satisfying, let it be remembered that this book consists of lectures originally delivered to a particular audience whose members were so much impressed by the clarity and depth of their content that a request came for publication. The book is designed accordingly as an introduction to start the reader thinking systematically and with understanding about things which cannot be contained within the covers of a book.

GEORGE DUBLIN.

THE DOCTRINE OF CREATION. (CHURCH DOGMATICS, Vol. III, 1.) By Karl Barth. T. and T. Clark. 45s.

Karl Barth's *Doctrine of Creation* comprises four volumes of his *Church Dogmatics*. The first only is now available in English. But the editors, Prof. G. W. Bromiley and Prof. T. F. Torrance, hope to publish the translation of the remaining three before long. They provide an admirable introductory summary and they, with the translators, deserve the gratitude of the English-speaking world for their remarkable achievement.

In Barth's view God's existence is no problem. The problem is the independent life of creation. But God's Spirit assures us beyond all

doubt that God has graciously chosen us in Christ to be his children and that *for this reason* he made the world.

Barth proceeds with an arresting exposition of Gen. 1 as constructed *prophetically* towards God's covenant with man, and of Gen. 2 as a *sacramental* token of the covenant itself. Then he shows creation as benefit, as reality and no illusion, and lastly as justified by God, who challenges us to "a brilliant affirmation not darkened by self-willed negation".

The reader feels, what the fascination of a personal meeting with Barth abundantly confirms, here speaks a man whose life is one great strain of joyful gratitude for God's goodness. Hence those eloquently towering sentences and the constant return to the one great theme.

The second volume bases man's true nature on the human nature of Christ, the third deals with God's Providence, and the last significantly gives us an Ethics. God commands the sanctification already of *creaturely* life. Man's duty to be active is certainly not neglected. Wherever the Church responds to Barth's teaching it is seen to be militant, as in the struggle against Hitler.

The many excursuses in small print should not be missed. They contain much excellent biblical exegesis and important discussions of Schopenhauer, Descartes, Leibnitz, Nietzsche, Heidegger, Sartre and Jaspers, as well as of Schleiermacher, Marcion and the great theologians of the Church. Barth rejoices also in reason and reasoning, knowing he has himself to make use of the philosophical concepts of our time.

We are often refreshed by humour and attracted by self-effacing humility, signs of true greatness which bases the whole of creaturely life on the one foundation of God's deeds in Christ.

Barth's method radically reverses what is natural to most of us as heirs of many ages of secularism. But if we turn to St Paul, St Augustine or St Anselm we see after all the same grand one-sidedness which cuts the Gordion knot of every problem of apologetics, communication and meaning by starting from God in Christ as "evidence" of the first order and leaving the care of all those problems to him. Undeniably Barth achieves great things because God's own power has free course in his words, as in the words of the prophets and their successors. As early as 1934 Barth exclaimed in his controversy with Brunner on "natural theology": "Why is the simple adherence to the one task suddenly called individualism and one-sidedness? Why not offer the world a reminder of Mark 1. 9: 'Arise, take up thy bed and walk'?"

But it can also not be denied that much truth about the realm of creation falls a victim to Barth's zeal to destroy what he thinks is but of man's own imagination; for instance, the objective realities of Plato's "ideas" and the sub-objective reality of time as discovered by Kant and Schopenhauer. Therefore to my mind St Augustine gets the better of the argument when Barth wishes to uphold against him creation *in* time instead of *with* time. A point of time which has itself no past is unthinkable.

Barth's prophetic method is not for everyone. Others are possible if only we adhere with Barth soberly, faithfully and humbly to what is "given" both "over against us" and in our own personalities. Looking for truths also outside the Judaeo-Christian sphere we may arrive at an even more adequate notion of God's greatness than the one Barth gives us.

But this opens up a wide field. Much discussion will have to continue towards a reconciliation of differences by clarification of meanings and the recovery of a faithful world-view on the grand scale of St Augustine and St Thomas. Barth's Doctrine of Creation is a most important contribution towards this goal.

G. Stock.

Oxford.

Theology and Modern Literature. By Amos N. Wilder. Harvard University Press (O.U.P.). 28s.

In his *Studies in Literature and Belief,* Fr Martin Jarrett-Kerr preferred risking the charge of being scrappy to distorting into a coherent scheme what he saw as true of individual works of art. Prof. Wilder is like him. Addressing himself to much the same subject, though with attention more exclusively to modern literature, he disarms the reader from the first. His book is "in the nature of a series of soundings or explorations . . . I am aware of the problem of literature and belief and have no simple answer to it". He confesses that his method is "selective and fragmentary". It is hard to see, in our day, how it could be otherwise and it is a joy to meet such humility and cautiousness.

Prof. Wilder suggests that "The human situation in our century has deepened both religion and art and brought them nearer together. . . . The muses sacred and profane agree". He quotes a letter of Dietrich Bonhoeffer, written from prison in 1944, in which he says that "a Christian instinct frequently draws me more to the religionless than to the religious, by which I mean not with any intention of evangelizing them, but rather, I might almost say, in 'brotherhood' ". This, suggests Prof. Wilder, was because the wrestling of the secular world "with the deepest questions is authentic and desperate", and he maintains that the deeper moral and spiritual issues of man to-day are often more powerfully canvassed by modern artists, "not identified with formal religion", than by theologians themselves. The novelist or poet often uncovers, for example, bewilderment and frustration with a discernment that the established churchman lacks, thus contributing to what Prof. Wilder sees as the "great task" of our age, "the reconception of the Christian ethic". He makes the illuminating observation that "appropriate conduct is, indeed, very much a matter of imagination, of spiritual tact, of sensitive perception. The greatest handicaps to creative social behaviour are rigidity and obtuseness."

Having acknowledged without reservation the principle that a

work of art is always to be understood in its own aesthetic terms, he continues, I believe rightly, to say that "all imaginative creations . . . have their own kind of declarative or cognitive role" and that it "is in this respect that modern literature opens itself to theological and moral scrutiny". The arts are more than embellishment, more than inspirational and mood-creating. They convey meaning.

With symbols as vehicles of meaning both modern poetry and modern Christian theology are specially concerned, and it is also significant that, as in contemporary theology, so in contemporary verse, "Hebraic concreteness is more at home . . . than Greek Platonism". The problem of communication in our day is similar both for the religious and the artist. This modest little collection of five lectures given at Harvard will indeed open up the view between Parnassus and Mount Zion.

R. T. Davies.

University of Liverpool.

SHORTER NOTICES

St Methodius: The Symposium. Translated and annotated by H. Musurillo. Volume 27 in the series "Ancient Christian Writers". Longmans. 21s.

The assignment, in this series, of the Symposium to Dr Musurillo is a happy one, for he has been at work on a revision of the text for the series "Sources chrétiennes". He bases the need of revision upon the fact that Bonwetsch made insufficient use of Ottobonianus gr. 59, which Dr Musurillo seems to prefer to the older Patmiacus gr. 202, though he hardly makes clear the reason for this preference. He sets store by articles of P. Heseler in *Byzant. neugr. Jahrbuch* for 1928 and 1933 in correction of Bonwetsch, and he makes a good case for regarding the production of a satisfactory text as more difficult than either Bonwetsch or Heseler appreciated.

Dr Musurillo adopts an attitude of thorough-going scepticism towards the asserted facts of the personal history of Methodius. He goes so far as to suggest that Methodius (equally with Eubulius) may have been a soubriquet, ousting the author's real name. (May not Eusebius, Praep. Evang., 7. 22, have rightly given it as Maximus?) But Dr Musurillo does not note that he is supported by the fact that the name Methodius is introduced into dialogue, at the end of the Symposium, supposed to take place in the lifetime of Thecla, Paul's disciple. On the other hand, he does make the interesting suggestion that "the lady from Termessus", who figures in the same passage, was, historically, a patroness of "Methodius", and leader of a household of consecrated Christian virgins, just such as we know to have existed later at Annesoi, formed by the ladies of the family of Basil the Great. Basil's sister Macrina also bore the name Thecla, in consequence of a dream of her mother before her birth; a dream dreamed less than a generation after the writing of the Symposium. If we

accept Dr Musurillo's suggestion, Annesoi was not the first household of its kind.

It is a pity that V. Buchheit's "Studien zu Methodios von Olympus" (*Texte u. Unters*, 1958) appeared after the volume under review went to press. But some readers of the latter will go on to Buchheit with quickened interest.

Dr Musurillo's notes are learned and appropriate, but rather stiff for readers not well grounded in such studies.

The Symposium itself is a strange piece of work, to which it is hardly useful to apply other adjectives, whether laudatory or critical. It is a writing that deserves more weighing and pondering than it has yet received.

FAVERSHAM. W. TELFER.

THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM. A Study Document issued by the Special Commission on Baptism of the Church of Scotland. St Andrew Press. 10s. 6d.

Into the space of sixty-nine pages the Commission has compressed the Report (somewhat longer) which it made to the General Assembly in 1955, taking into account comments and criticisms received from Presbyteries in the meantime. Yet the new and more public edition does not appear unduly condensed.

The Appendix, entitled "Our Approach to the Biblical Tradition", should be read first, and is valuable in its own right. In the document itself the New Testament data are viewed against the background, not only of Old Testament thought and practice, but of those also of the post-apostolic Church and of developed Judaism with its sects, including Qumran. The understanding so reached is both broad and deep. The saving Work of Christ, focused in his Death and Resurrection, is rightly kept in the centre. The Incarnation, the Baptism of our Lord, and the Spirit-bestowal of Pentecost, on the other hand, are carefully brought into relation. The unity and wholeness of Baptism are for the most part well expressed and maintained throughout. Spirit-endowment is predicated of Baptism itself, sacramentally speaking, along with "cleansing" and "regeneration". The priority of the divine initiative over the human response is emphasized; and there is a particularly telling section on the propriety of Infant Baptism.

Certain questions are left unanswered, and in some cases unasked. Is something necessarily effected in the candidate by the act of Baptism? One may agree in rejecting the *ex opere operato* view and in favouring the term "efficacious sign", and may still regard that question as important. Is there in the New Testament evidence of a Spirit-gift beyond that of Baptism and necessary to its "perfecting"? Many have thought and taught so. Not even in a footnote are readers reminded of this. The authors' avowed wish to stress the unity of outward and inward in Hebraic idiom is poorly served by the language of *two* "pledges" or "seals", viz. Baptism *and* the Spirit-gift

(pp. 28, 40). The words used of Christ's own "Spirit-Baptism" could have been better chosen (p. 17). In one place, concerning immersion and affusion as alternatives, the importance of symbolism in sacramental action is underestimated (p. 24).

A genuine and largely successful effort has been made to transcend the bounds of any one tradition. The theological *provenance* is apparent from the place given to the theology of Covenant, and the geographical from the phrase "Forthcoming it believes that . . ." (p. 67).

Misprints occur on p. 45, l. 10, and p. 53, l. 25. A second impression would benefit from the addition of a bibliography and perhaps also an index.

JOHN C. SLADDEN.

LOWER PEOVER VICARAGE,
KNUTSFORD.

RELIGIONS. By D. W. Gundry. Macmillan. 16s.

MYTH AND RITUAL IN THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST. By E. O. James. Thames and Hudson. 35s.

PATTERNS IN COMPARATIVE RELIGION. By Mircea Eliade. Sheed and Ward. 25s.

Recently the emphasis in post-ordination training in these parts has shifted from examinations to the preparing and reading of papers on approved lines of modest research. One man chose "the non-Christian religions" as his subject. I was able without hesitation to recommend Mr Gundry's *Religions*. Somewhat in the manner of a course of lectures, Mr Gundry gives us introductory chapters on "What is Religion?", "The Origins of Religion" and "The Religious Quest of the Ancient World". Concisely and clearly he goes on to summarize the main points of "The Undeveloped Religions" (Primitives; Shinto); "The Monistic Religions" (The Unknown One; Taoism; Confucianism; Hinduism; Buddhism); and "The Monotheistic Religions" (The Known God; Hebrew Religion; Zoroastrianism; Islam; Christianity). A final chapter on "Religion as Decision" gives him the opportunity to witness further to what has been clear throughout; the convinced Christian standpoint from which he exercises the broadest of sympathies. Endpapers and bibliography are excellent. Is the omission of communism from the index and from the Asian parts of his book deliberate? As regards Asia, it is not a correct generalization that "since the advent of Indian independence Christian missions have been curbed by nationalist legislation. Mission hospitals and schools are still welcomed, but direct religious teaching is discouraged, if not forbidden" (p. 99). India is a genuinely "secular" state and proud of it. And this, by the way, is one of the issues in Kashmir.

To another student whose choice of subject was "Archaeology and Old Testament Religion", I did not feel able so readily to commend Prof. James on *Myth and Ritual in the Ancient Near East*. The publishers justly claim that "attention has been concentrated on the

evidence obtained through excavation and the discovery, decipherment and translation of numerous texts hitherto unknown or unread". The endpapers are helpful, the chapter headings logical and the printing and production admirable. But I must confess that this is heavy fare for the general reader, lightened by only an occasional happy generalization (see end of Chapter 6 e.g.). This is a book for the expert; and as far as the general reader with a biblical interest can see, a judicious one. For example, Prof. James is properly cautious in his estimate of the Iranian influence on later Jewish eschatology; and the same lucid judgment pervades his section on Palestinian aetiological myths.

Patterns in Comparative Religion I found far more readable. Despite an occasional banality (e.g. "a lot of", p. 260), the translator succeeds in conveying Prof. Eliade's lofty conception of the unity of human experience which pervades his detailed examination of "hierophanies". "The solidarity of all forms and actions of life . . . is one of the most essential concepts of primitive man" (p. 354). Of this concept the author approves. At one point he suggestively relates an agricultural way of life with a unitive view of life. He believes that any natural object can, and at one time probably has, provided an effective vehicle for religious experience. In an important note (p. 30) he sees hierophanies in general as prefigurations of the Incarnation. Not that he confuses the developed with the undeveloped or presents us with a spurious "noble savage". In a somewhat difficult last chapter he finds the essential difference between natural and revealed religion in terms of "history". But his general philosophy of the unity of human, and in particular of religious, experience does give coherence to his examination of such subjects as the sky and sky gods; the sun and sun worship; the moon and its mystique; water symbolism; sacred stones; the earth, woman and fertility; sacred time and the myth of eternal renewal.

For myself I enjoyed many fascinating details. I now know that the legend whereby St Francis Xavier stuck his staff in the ground to mark a halting place in South India, and the staff grew overnight into a great cross now enshrined in a famous church, falls into a pattern of vegetation myths and has a close parallel in Muslim hagiology. I can now relate the Tamil association of their O symbol (embryonic in form) with the world's creation to a whole pattern of egg symbolism. The occasional practice in South India of dressing a boy in girl's clothes, I had always thought to be, like the custom of not praising a baby's looks, a mere attempt to deceive the evil spirits. Now I know that it ties in with a whole pattern of androgynous behaviour, as, doubtless unawares, do the hilarious dances I have seen performed by aboriginal Christians in the same area. And having read Prof. Eliade on "sacred time", I think I now know why the Brahmin gentleman, medical officer of health at a busy seaport, who bought my second-hand Ford Anglia, would not actually pay down the cash until the clock struck twelve!

Millhouses,
Sheffield.

A. H. Dammers.

THE OXFORD BOOK OF SCHOOL WORSHIP. (Parts II and III.) S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

For nearly five years Directors of Religious Education have found themselves saying: "One of the best books for the morning assembly is *The Oxford Book of School Worship*, but it is out of print." Although this edition is described as revised, the changes are few; e.g. "British Commonwealth" supersedes "Empire" and a prayer for the League of Nations disappears. The helpful index of hymns still refers to six hymn books existing at the time of the 1936 edition, but not, unfortunately, to *Hymns Ancient and Modern Revised* (1950). Incidentally, the 1958 *School Edition of Hymns Ancient and Modern* is not only proving an acceptable school hymn book, but contains forms of prayer which may supplement what the Oxford book provides, as the compilers themselves suggest.

Permanently useful features of the Oxford book include articles on the principles of school worship, collected forms of prayer and praise (those for seniors being especially valuable), a comprehensive prayer index, a carefully chosen lectionary with hints on its use, and notes on private prayer and on hymn singing. Unlike some others, this book assumes instruction in the Christian faith and the Church's life, and will assist teachers both in County and Church schools.

SALISBURY. JEFFREY S. MAPLES.

BOOK NOTES

A Guide to the Scrolls by A. R. C. Leaney, R. P. C. Hanson and J. Posen (S.C.M. Press, 8s. 6d.) is one of the best books of its kind for the non-expert that we have seen. It is furnished with chronological tables and other useful background information. The Scrolls themselves are described, the theories about the Qumran community are explained, and the bearing of the discoveries on the New Testament is examined. From Messrs Peter Owen, Ltd, come two handy works of reference. *Concise Dictionary of Judaism*, edited by D. D. Runes (35s.), contains definitions of a wide variety of technical terms that crop up in Jewish literature and also biographical data about Jews who have been eminent across the centuries. *Encyclopedia of the Papacy* by Hans Kühner (35s.) contains brief biographies of all the popes and is more amenable to consultation than, e.g., *The Catholic Encyclopaedia*. Prof. Frederick C. Grant contributes a foreword to a new edition of Edwin Hatch's *The Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity* (Harper Torchbook, Hamish Hamilton, 11s. 6d.), and calls attention to the points at which the advance of knowledge would require a modification of Hatch's statements: he has also added an extensive and up-to-date bibliography. Other new Harper Torchbooks are George Santayana's *Interpretations of Poetry and Religion* (Hamish Hamilton, 11s. 6d.) and Henry Osborn Taylor's *The Emergence of Christian Culture in the West: the Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages* (Hamish Hamilton, 14s.): Prof. Kenneth M. Setton contributes a foreword and bibliography to the latter. *Glasgow Speaks: a Reply to the Joint Report on Anglican-Presbyterian Relations* (House of Grant, 2s.) is a Report that was prepared for, and approved by an overwhelming majority of, the Presbytery of Glasgow. While it rejects the proposals for "Bishops-in-Presbytery" on theological grounds, e.g. on the ground that they represent a confusion of unity with uniformity, it nevertheless expresses a desire for further conversations between the Church of Scotland and the Church of England. This Report will have to be taken seriously by all who are concerned with Anglican-Presbyterian relations. Father Gerald Vann's *The Son's Course*, which is published as a Fontana book by Collins (2s. 6d.), is about the incarnate life of our

Lord. It has been constructed partly from his previously published works and partly from newly written material. The April–June number of the *Church Quarterly Review* contains an article by Dr E. L. Mascall in which he examines that part of the Lambeth Conference Report which dealt with Christian unity.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ABINGDON PRESS (NEW YORK): Walter G. Muehler, *Foundations of the Responsible Society* ($6.00).

ANGLICAN GROUP FOR THE ORDINATION OF WOMEN (10 CLARENCE GATE GARDENS, N.W.1): Margaret J. Roxburgh, *Women's Work in the Church of England* (1s.); O. Jessie Lace, *The Ordination of Women to the Historic Ministry of the Church* (1s.).

BROWNE AND NOLAN (DUBLIN): Dermot Murray, *About Hell* (1s. 6d.).

BURNS AND OATES: François Amiot, *History of the Mass* (7s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: Russell Brain, *Science, Philosophy and Religion* (4s. 6d.).

CAREY KINGSGATE PRESS: Ernest A. Payne, *The Baptist Union: A Short History* (21s.).

GEOFFREY CHAPMAN: Albert Giovannetti, *We Have a Pope* (10s. 6d.); Robert Johann, S.J., *The Meaning of Love* (16s.); Louis Bouyer, *Christian Humanism* [Eng. trans. of *Humain ou Chrétien*] (10s. 6d.).

CHRISTOPHERS: Peter R. Ackroyd, *The People of the Old Testament* (15s.).

CHURCH INFORMATION BOARD: *The Christian Stewardship of Money* (2s. 6d.).

COLLINS: Murdo Macdonald, *The Need to Believe* (2s. 6d.).

EPWORTH PRESS: Alfred C. Lamb, *Heirs to Responsibility* (10s. 6d.).

FABER: Josef Pieper, *Happiness and Contemplation* (12s. 6d.).

HAMISH HAMILTON: Alexandre Koyré, *From the Closed World to the Infinite Universe* (12s. 6d.); Josiah Royce, *The Religious Aspect of Philosophy* (14s.); F. M. Cornford, *From Religion to Philosophy* (11s.).

LONGMANS: Kenelm Foster (Ed.), *The Life of Saint Thomas Aquinas* (30s.); Arthur Anton Vogel, *Reality, Reason and Religion* (30s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: A. Gilmore (Ed.), *Christian Baptism* (27s. 6d.); Otto Weber, *Ground Plan of the Bible* (27s. 6d.); J. M. Shaw, *The Wonder of the Christian Gospel* (12s. 6d.); T. F. Torrance, *Conflict and Agreement in the Church.* Vol. I: *Order and Disorder* (45s.).

MACMILLAN: H. D. McDonald, *Ideas of Revelation* (30s.).

MACMILLAN (NEW YORK): Julian Price Love, *How to Read the Bible* (27s. 6d.).

P. R. MACMILLAN: Hugh K. Trevaskis, *Christianity and the Atom* (15s.).

MOWBRAYS: Father Francis, S.S.F., *Brother Douglas* (7s. 6d.); Gilbert Shaw, *The Face of Love* (21s.).

OLIVER AND BOYD: Hermann Diem, *Dogmatics* (30s.); Karl Heim, *Jesus the Lord* (18s.).

ST ALBERT'S PRESS (AYLESFORD): S. G. A. Luff, *The First Monks and Hermits* (2s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Karl Barth, *A Shorter Commentary on Romans* (15s.); Alfred R. Shands, *The Liturgical Movement and the Local Church* (8s. 6d.); George S. Hendry, *The Gospel of the Incarnation* (15s.).

SHEED AND WARD: Caryll Houselander, *The Risen Christ* (8s. 6d.); James Killgallon and Gerard Weber, *Christ in Us* (10s. 6d. and 6s.).

S.P.C.K.: Leonard Hodgson, *Church and Sacraments in Divided Christendom* (1s. 9d.); H. C. Robins, *The Conquest of Fear* (1s.); A. P. Taylor, *Our Father's House* (3s. 6d.); W. Montgomery Watt, *The Cure for Human Troubles* (15s.).

S.P.G.: Dewi Morgan, *Living is Belonging: S.P.G. Review of the Year's Work* (1s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

BEAUFOYS

SANCTUARY

COMMUNION WINE

Beaufoys *Sanctuary* Wine is of the highest standard, produced and bottled in Great Britain with the fermented juice of the finest quality grapes. As sole suppliers to the S.P.C.K. Beaufoys are proud to offer you this wine which has been prepared especially for Church purposes.

7/6d Per Bottle

(Postage 2/- on 1 Bottle, 2/3d on 2 Bottles, 2/6d on 3 Bottles)

Packing and Carriage Free on all orders exceeding three bottles

Quantities of one dozen or over may be obtained through the S.P.C.K delivered free and subject to special quantity reductions of 1/- per dozen; 1/6 per dozen on 2 dozen; and 2/- per dozen on 3 dozen or more.

THIS IS OUR FAITH

C. M. Chavasse **5s**

In the Foreword the Bishop of Rochester writes, "I had become increasing aware of the general lack of doctrinal knowledge among Church-people. . . . My charge therefore, has taken the form of a simple primer on Christian doctrine".

CHURCH AND SACRAMENTS IN DIVIDED CHRISTENDOM

L. Hodgson **1s 9d**

Dr Hodgson's vivid and trenchant phrases bring home the implications of what he has to say, in our daily lives as members of the Church.

TOWARDS THE CENTRE

Charles Jeffries **4s 6d**

"An admirably comprehensive and yet fair and lucid attempt" to present to lay people the problems of Re-union and the steps so far taken. "Whatever may appear on the surface, the undercurrents are flowing towards the centre and the centre is Christ. Appended are questions on each chapter and suggestions for more detailed study." *Expository Times.*

THE FAITH TO-DAY

Mervyn Stockwood **5s net**

"A clean and down to earth exposition of the Christian faith and practical implications. It is definite without being cocksure and challenging without being strident. There are no flowers of rhetoric but there is plenty of wit." *Dr A. R. Vidler in Theology.*

CRY DAWN IN DARK BABYLON

P. W. Turner **5s net**

A play, by the author of *Christ in the concrete City*, about the contemporary religious situation, honest in facing genuine difficulty and the apparent impotency of the Church, moving in revealing the heavenly strength which can come from the human weakness. (4 M., 4 F.)

S·P·C·K